UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Confessions of an Agnostic Clergyman - - - - - - - *E. Stanton Hodgin*

What Stake in Capitalism? - - *Leo Hirsch*

Religion, Not Race, the Basis of Judaism - - - - - - - *Arthur L. Weatherly*

THE STUDY TABLE

VOLUME CXXIX NUMBER 9

Chicago, November, 1943

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878
(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Contributors

C. A. Hawley: Minister of First Presbyterian Church, Atchison, Kansas.

Leo Hirsch: Former lecturer under auspices of the William Allen White Committee.

E. Stanton Hodgin: Formerly minister of Unitarian churches in Minneapolis, Los Angeles, and New Bedford; now living in California.

Arthur L. Weatherly: Retired minister of All Souls' Unitarian Church, Lincoln, Nebraska; well-known leader in the civic life of the city and the state.

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Editorial Comments—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 131
Jottings—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 134

ARTICLES—
Confessions of an Agnostic Clergyman—E. STANTON HODGIN .. 134
What Stake in Capitalism?—LEO HIRSCH 138
Religion, Not Race, the Basis of Judaism—ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY 141

THE STUDY TABLE—
Vilification of Thomas Paine—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 141
Goodness Without Power—CURTIS W. REESE 142
Message of Hope—or Counsel of Despair?—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 142
The Yale Lectures—C. A. HAWLEY 143

CORRESPONDENCE—
Relative Virtues—ARTHUR D. WEAGE 143
Co-Pilot—MAY STRANATHAN 144
Pacifist Terms—VICTOR S. YARROS 144
Whitman Article Commended—HENRIETTE POSNER 144
Ethical Writings Needed—CARL PETERSON 144
The Coleman Case—LUCIA TRENT 144

THE FIELD—
Federated Theological School 130

The Field

Federated Theological School

With theological educators from all sections of the nation invited to participate, a special service of inauguration and dedication of the new Federated Theological Faculty of the University of Chicago was held Monday night, October 25, at Rockefeller Memorial Chapel on the campus of the University.

The service was preceded by an academic procession, beginning at 8 p.m. This occasion marked the first joint appearance of the combined faculties and the combined student bodies of the four theological schools which make up the federation.

Speakers at the service were President Robert M. Hutchins of the University, who discussed "The Place of Theological Education in a University"; the Reverend Albert W. Palmer, President of the Chicago Theological Seminary, who discussed "Unity and Freedom in Theological Education"; and the Reverend Douglas Horton, Minister of the General Council of Congregational Christian Churches, who came from New York City for this event. He spoke on "Theological Education in the Service of Ecumenical Christianity."

It should be emphasized that this new plan contemplates no change in the financial independence, ecclesiastical affiliation, business operations, or self-government of the respective institutions.

The terms of the agreement include the following provisions: (1) All full-time members of the faculties of the separate institutions become members of the faculty of the University of Chicago at their present academic rank. (2) The federated faculty becomes the faculty of each separate institution. (3) All students in the four institutions will be registered as graduate students of the University. (4) The minimum academic entrance requirement will be the equivalent of graduation from the College of the University of Chicago. (5) The academic year, as in other schools of the University, will consist of four terms of twelve weeks each. (6) The Federated Theological Faculty will have control of the common elements of the Bachelor of Divinity curriculum and of the general pattern of work for that degree. Quantitatively these common elements will consist of approximately two-thirds of the Bachelor of Divinity curriculum. This portion of the curriculum will be the same in all the institutions. (7) In order to maintain the individual corporate life and promote the *esprit de corps,* each of the institutions will have an Administrative Council made up of the president of that institution and such members of the Federated Theological Faculty as may be chosen. Normally these will be men from the denominational background represented by the institution. This council will have general direction of institutional policies, particularly the one-third of Bachelor of Divinity curriculum which is left to each institution to determine, and also all matters having to do with student life and awarding of scholarships and other forms of student aid. (8) Students who complete satisfactorily the course of training will receive

(*Continued on page* 144)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXIX NOVEMBER, 1943 No. 9

Editorial Comments

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

I often wonder why so many people are pacifists in time of peace, only to abandon their pacifism when peace goes and war comes. Here are certain Quakers, for example, spreading dissension and disturbance in their religious body, by supporting this war as vigorously as any member of the American Legion. What did they think they were doing, in all these years gone by, when they were ardent in a cause which now when the issue is not remote but right at hand, not theoretical but practical, is calling for support? Didn't they ever think the question of pacifism through? Didn't they have imagination enough to forecast the coming of just such a Hitlerian crisis as now confronts us, and sense enough to decide in advance what they would do in such a crisis? Hitler has been in office for ten years; from the beginning of these years his character and purpose were unmistakable; during all of these years the second World War was impending. Why did these non-pacifist Quakers wait until after the war was on, to change their position? Then there are the Bahaists, the orthodox group, apostates to the great ideal of peace to which their immortal prophets, Baha-O-Llah and Abdul Baha, gave the service and sacrifice of their heroic lives! There can be no question as to what these leaders taught their followers. The Bahaist Tablets are among the great pacifist literature of modern times. Yet in this war, exactly as in the last war, the Bahaists abandoned all the high professions which they preached in days of peace, and went precipitately over to the business of fighting. In the war of the American Revolution, Thomas Paine discovered that there were "summer soldiers and sunshine patriots." When the days were warm, and life out-of-doors was pleasant, and the war was going well, then there were plenty of men to shoulder muskets and march along in the armies of freedom. But when the winter set in, and the weather was bitter cold, and the ground was frozen like iron, and the fighting was not so good, then the men went home, and the armies began to dissolve. "Summer soldiers and sunshine patriots"! Well, we have the same sort of "soldiers" and "patriots" in the pacifist movement. As long as the days are fair, and there is little difficulty and no danger, it is easy to be a pacifist—and pacifists spring up on every hand. But when war comes, and pacifism is put to the test of all its faith, then so many change their minds. They didn't know that it was going to be like this! Didn't *know?* What kind of a world do these pseudo-pacifists think we have been living in since 1914?

II

Ernie Pyle, whose book of war dispatches has just been published, is a remarkable newspaper columnist. There is a simple human quality about him that is exceptional. He seems to understand the hearts of men, and to have that mystical power of interpretation that lies close to religion. Central to his whole life is a certain compassion which makes him a friend to all whom he meets and knows. It is difficult to imagine Ernie Pyle as thinking an unkind thought or doing an ungenerous deed. In recent months this reporter has been in Tunisia, sending remarkable dispatches to the *New York World-Telegram* and other newspapers. His stories about life in the army have touched the hearts of millions of readers, and been a precious tie between North Africa and America. A certain dispatch discusses the business of killing. Pyle tells of the change that comes over the soldier boys after they have been at the front for a little time. They take on "a new professional attitude," he writes, "where killing is a craft." They want to kill—"individually, or in vast numbers." Referring to the typical soldier, he says:

> He wants to see the Germans overrun, mangled, butchered in the Tunisian trap. He speaks excitedly of seeing great heaps of dead, of our bombers sinking whole shiploads of fleeing men, of Germans by the thousands dying miserably in a final Tunisian holocaust of his own creation.

In all this there is no hatred—only an intense desire to end the war, and "to destroy enough Germans to do it." For the fighting soldier, says Pyle, "killing is as much a profession as writing is to me." But Pyle can't see or feel it this way, and is honest enough to confess it. He blurts right out and says, "Killing to me is still murder." He thinks this is because his "own life is in danger only by occasional chance or circumstance." But may it not be because there is something

fine within him that has not been trained out of him? At any rate, he confesses that in the night watches, when he is lying in his bedroll, trying to sleep, "the enormity of all these newly dead strikes like a living nightmare. And there are times when I feel I can't stand it and will have to leave." Which brings to mind the thought of how we myriads of people here at home would feel if, like Pyle, we were suddenly brought face to face with the realities of the battlefield! Would we not also see killing as "murder," and stop it forthwith? After all, there's only one way to keep men at war, and that is to cover the killing with glory and honor, and fill the public mind with propaganda stories of heroism and sacrifice. Then we stay-at-homes don't see, nor even imagine, what is going on. But the soldier sees, and he kills because he has to; and Ernie Pyle sees, and shudders at "murder" before his very eyes.

III

Hiram Motherwell sends the following in a letter to the *New York Times:*

> The policy of reducing Germany to servitude for a generation, of degrading the lives of millions of human beings, and of depriving a whole nation of happiness, should be abhorrent and detestable even if it were possible; even if it did not sow the decay of the whole civilized life of Europe Nations are not authorized by religion or by natural morals to visit on the children of their enemies the misdoings of parents or of rulers.

Immediately after this paragraph in his letter, he appends the following:

> I have taken the liberty of omitting the quotation marks from the above excerpt from *The Economic Consequences of the Peace,* written by Mr. (now Lord) John Maynard Keynes in the fall of 1919.

It might be well for us to ponder this statement by Mr. Keynes, made after the last war in reference to the Versailles Treaty, as we now move on to another peace conference for the writing of another treaty to end this present war. Two things are conspicuous in this statement. First, the prophecy as to "the decay of the whole civilized life of Europe"! That decay set in immediately after the victorious Allies reduced Germany to servitude and deprived a whole nation of happiness, and continued uninterruptedly to the collapse into the madness of the Hitler regime. Secondly, the moral principle laid down—that "nations are not authorized by religion or by natural morality to visit on the children of their enemies the misdoings of parents or of rulers"! We talk so glibly of punishing the German people for this war! But how are we going to try the German people? Nobody, even the fiercest anti-Nazi, argues that Hitler is going to be punished without trial. Even such a war as this is not going to end in a lynching party. But in all the talk about the people of Germany being as guilty as their rulers, I have yet to find any suggestion as to how they shall be indicted, tried, and convicted. Here something like a lynching is apparently in order! And who *are* the German people? Tens of millions of them at least are babes in arms, and school children, and adolescents, and young men and women, and tottering old folks. Are these to be punished along with mature voters? And if not, how are they to be set apart and spared when the nation is dismembered, its industries leveled to the ground, and the Germans generally bowed to the yoke of political subserviency? The very thought of "degrading the lives of millions of human beings," as Keynes puts it, should be "abhorrent and detestable" to us all. Yet it is being commended by those in authority, just as though we had never heard of the precepts of that Christianity for the sake of which we say that we are fighting.

IV

More and more apparent does it become that the war is being won and lost in Russia. It is this fact that stirs the question as to whether Stalin will make a separate peace with Germany. But this question, it seems to me, is usually discussed from the wrong angle —namely, that of Russia seeking or accepting peace of Germany. We talk about the generous terms that Hitler can afford to offer Russia. But wherein is Hitler in any position to offer terms of peace to anybody, least of all to the Soviets? When did the vanquished ever thus deal with the victors? The real question, as I see it, is whether Germany will sue for peace, and turn to Russia in preference to the United Nations, and accept terms from the former before the latter are in any position to act at all. It is to be remembered that Stalin, through his Free Germany Committee, has already stated terms, and that these terms are generous in the light of his sweeping military triumphs. On the other hand, the United Nations talk about nothing but "unconditional surrender"—and behind this slogan lurk all kinds of threats of disarmament, territorial dismemberment, industrial ruin, reparations, and so forth, none of which appear in the Russian terms at all. In such a situation, with inevitable defeat looming all about them, with real hope of salvaging much out of a peace with Russia and no hope of salvaging anything out of a peace with America and Britain, what is to prevent Germany turning to Moscow and putting her fate, and the fate of course of Europe, in her hands? And what is to prevent Stalin making peace on terms which will consolidate the Russian position for generations to come? It is never to be forgotten that Joseph Stalin is a realist to the core. He has not one spark of sentimentalism. He is interested only in Russia; he is fighting only for Russia (he remained at peace while France was extinguished and England all but beaten, and fought only when attacked!); and he will in the end seek only Russia's advantage. We fool ourselves in cherishing any illusions about the Soviet dictator. This is what makes so formidable the possibility that, at the right moment, the German army will depose Hitler, accept from Russia terms of peace which will

leave Germany strong, and thus to all intents and purposes achieve an alliance—with Russia still at peace with Japan!—which may defy the world. One would think, to read of Churchill's and Roosevelt's meetings and pronunciamentos, that they held all power in their hands but they don't—not if Stalin has anything to say about it!

V

No one has ever seen or heard of a general who had enough soldiers, or an admiral who had enough ships, or a king, premier, or president who had enough money. That's why the legislature in a democracy, Parliament, or Congress must stand stoutly between the people and the executives who would devour them. It is no accident that the instant and dominant sign of the passing of democracy into dictatorship is the disappearance of the legislative branch of government. In Germany, Italy, and Russia alike, the representatives of the voters were either disbanded or reduced to the status of mere puppets and the executives took over all power. In our own country, there has been no more disquieting sign of the times in recent years than the subserviency of Congress to the President. Senate and House alike were willing to serve as mere rubber stamps for the White House. When the Executive attempted likewise to subdue the judiciary in the unforgettable attack on the Supreme Court, the spell was broken, and the Senate gloriously asserted itself. But it has remained for this present Congress really to come to life. That its action has in all cases been wise I would assert as little as I would expect such infallibility from human beings. But the great thing is that Congress has resumed once again its constitutional functions of government, and dares to call the President and even the military to account. That this is welcome to the people, I must believe. How otherwise explain the political overturn in the elections of 1942? Says no less a man than Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr., of Wisconsin, in an article in a recent issue of the *Progressive:*

> After a long and patient experience of being pushed one way and then another by the Administration's omniscient bureaucracy, the people look more and more to Congress for a chance to participate once again in the shaping of our national program. They expect their representatives in Congress to be alert and independent, and not rubber stamps for the Executive. By the same token, they are in no mood to tolerate a dog-in-the-manger attitude toward the Administration in this hour of great decision.

Here is a fair and pertinent statement of the situation. What we are witnessing in this country is a restoration of the democratic process. The rule of one man is over for good and all. This is not only healthy for America, but it is prophetic for the world. The tide has turned from all ideas of infallible leadership, and is at last sweeping back to the people themselves. "The people have been doing some serious thinking," says Senator La Follette. They certainly have! And the results will be seen when the chaos of this age is past, and liberty and peace are with us once again.

VI

The news from the liquor front gets better and better with every passing day. The nation is waking up once again to the perils of the "booze" racket, and slowly but surely is proceeding to put it out of business. As the "Drys" are once again militant, so the "Wets" are discouraged and alarmed. And well they may be! In a recent issue of the *New York Herald-Tribune,* for example, there appears a detailed survey of the liquor situation throughout the country, which is significantly headed, "Militant Drys Regaining Power." The method used in the present fight is that of local option—taking unit after unit of territory, in city, town, or village, or even a whole state, and voting out the traffic! Already there are three states which are totally "dry"—Kansas, Oklahoma, and Mississippi. In addition there are ten states, according to this article in a "wet" newspaper, which would go "dry" if statewide prohibition votes were taken, as they will be in due course. These states are Utah, South Dakota, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Texas, and Tennessee. "Dry" counties in so-called "wet" states are numerous and are steadily multiplying. Thus, in Kentucky, 76 out of a total of 120 counties are "dry," and four more county elections are coming up this month, "with the 'Drys' expected to win." Last year (1942), in local option elections held throughout the country, the "Drys" gained 162 units and the "Wets" 43 units, which shows a net gain for the "Drys" of 119 local areas, involving a population of 698,114. The author of this *Herald-Tribune* article finds comfort in the fact that 1034 bills affecting the liquor industry and traffic were introduced into the legislatures of forty-two states, and that only 236 of these bills passed. But all of these measures, let it be noted, were restrictive, or prohibitive, in character; they were attacks upon the intrenched power of the richest and most unscrupulous business in this country; and that more than one-fifth of these bills were enacted into law is to my mind enormously encouraging. Still more encouraging is this huge number of proposed reforms. Such bills would never in the world be introduced if there were not an aggressive and important body of public sentiment behind them. A fifth of these bills passed every year will mount soon to an impressive total! What this means is that the anti-liquor movement is once again well under way. The "booze" barons realize perfectly well that they have a new fight on their hands. They must feel like the Nazis, as they see overwhelming defeat headed straight in their direction. O, to get our newspapers clear and clean of liquor "ads." and our radios of beer and whiskey talks and our streets of saloons and taverns—this will make life worth living once again. Speed on the good work! Make this a quick job and thorough!

Jottings

One hundred and thirty years ago, in his *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage,* Lord Byron meditated on Italy, as we might meditate today:

> Italia! oh Italia! thou who hast
> The fatal gift of beauty, which became
> A funeral dower of present woes and past,
> On thy sweet brow is sorrow ploughed by shame,
> And annals graved in characters of flame. . . .

Mussolini thought that he was Caesar come again. Now we know that he was only Caligula, or Elagabulus, or one of the other savage clowns who disgraced the Roman throne.

It's amusing to hear the radio news-reporters put their fine Italian twist of pronunciation on such a name as Salerno (Sa-laire-no), and then go right ahead talking about Naples and Milan. Why not Napoli and Milano? Perhaps less affectation and more common-sense would be healthful for us all.

Hitler has burned and looted Naples, and left the city as wrecked as nearby Pompeii. Is this a grim warning of what he proposes to do to Rome, Florence, Milan, Venice, Prague, Brussels, Paris, when he retires from these cities? Alas, for Europe!

As the Allied armies stand amid the ruins of Pompeii and Naples, they have a chance to compare the destruction wrought by an ancient volcano and that wrought by modern arms in war. Which is worse?

On a certain Sunday recently in New York, a clergyman of a leading church preached on the subject, "Awake, Thou that sleepest." At the same hour, at another church, another clergyman spoke on "The Fine Art of Sleeping." Looks as though sleeping in church were on the increase!

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Confessions of an Agnostic Clergyman

E. STANTON HODGIN

Having prepared a sizable volume of reminiscences, mainly to relieve my own mind, which I call "Confessions of an Agnostic Clergyman," I have condensed it into a single article for UNITY. Knowing how fatal to vitality overcondensation is, I am confining myself to one of the fifteen chapters, in which I try to explain how I became a minister in spite of my skeptical disposition.

The word "clergyman" is and always has been a misnomer when applied to me. I have always been anti-church in my general attitude, regarding church-religion as something superficial, resting on unwarranted assumptions. I absorbed this attitude from my early surroundings, and all of my studies and experiences have served to confirm it. The "Wilbur" Friends, among whom I spent my formative days, would not use the word "church" when applied to themselves and regarded all churches as claiming something that was entirely beyond human reach.

Friends (Quakers) tried to completely de-institutionalize religion. They wished to establish a purely spiritual faith. They failed; but they held tenaciously to their ideal for two centuries, and succeeded in reducing institutional religion to its lowest terms. "Wilbur" Friends were the best example of that endeavor in the nineteenth century. They did not attempt to "teach" religion and theology in their schools and Meetings as other religious bodies did. To them, religion was not something that could be successfully "taught" or handed about from person to person.

Early in the nineteenth century the Society of Friends, like ancient Gaul, became divided into three unequal parts. The larger body, often called "Gourney" Friends, yielded quite largely to the evangelical influences that surrounded them, both in their theological beliefs and in their administration. They began to hold revival meetings and to talk about conversion and sanctification as glibly as did their Methodist neighbors. Another branch known as "Hicksite" Friends leaned toward the Unitarian position, sometimes even uniting their forces with the arch heretics of the time. Another little group known as "Wilbur" Friends were uninfluenced by either movement and were left in a rather high and dry state of helpless isolation.

I was a member of the "Wilbur" Friends' Society during my adolescent days, attending their school and Meetings regularly, and being unacquainted with any other religious institution.

It is impossible to elucidate the theology of the "Wilbur" Friends of the 1870s. They themselves could not have stated it in clear-cut terms. The chief virtue of their theology lay in its indefiniteness. They understood the futility of trying to define spiritual realities. The hard-and-fast, mechanical scheme of salvation as set forth by the evangelical churches of that time was abhorrent to them, although the larger body of "Gourney" Friends had become infected by it.

Such words as "revival," "salvation," "conversion," "heaven," and "hell" used in the smug absolutist sense in which they were freely bandied about by the evangelicals (even by evangelical Friends) was extremely distasteful to the "Wilburs." They could not conceive of a person being "lost" one day and "saved" the next, or as rising to the heights of a heaven of perfection at a bound or as sinking to the depths of a total hell in the same way. No one could truthfully say that he was either saved or lost in any complete sense. Salvation was a process not a status. Whoever lived a good life and shared it with others, thought good thoughts and shared them, gained as much salvation as he earned

and was capable of experiencing.

But so small a body were these "Wilbur" Friends and so great was the evangelical influence surrounding them, that they were in a sense overwhelmed by it. When forced to define their terms in self-defense, they had no vocabulary at their command. Gradually and reluctantly they began to use evangelical terms, though they never accepted them in the complete and absolutist sense of the revivalists. They lived by faith rather than by definition. Such I believe to be a fair statement of the position of "Wilbur" Friends in Eastern Iowa when I knew them from 1873 to 1887.

As I advanced toward maturity I unconsciously acquiesced in the Friends' conception of religion as a life rather than a belief. If I had been compelled to define my position in theological terms I could not have done so. I would have been forced to use evangelical terms that were hateful to me, as they were to many Friends who likewise felt forced occasionally to use them.

When I left the Friends' community and returned to Dakota, I was in a state of religious confusion for some years. For the first time I began attending different churches. I also attended some of the revival services that were prevalent in those days. I did not know whether to be more impressed or more shocked by the dogmatic assurance of evangelical ministers who assumed all wisdom and all knowledge concerning ultimate and final things. They never seemed to doubt that an eternity of bliss or an eternity of woe could be determined by a word or a gesture. That we were living in such a universe seemed an awful thing to me but I did not have sufficient strength of mind to stand against it, though I did not accept it.

As time passed and I became hardened somewhat to the changed conditions, I began to wonder if it would be my turn to be converted and saved much as it seemed to be everybody's turn to have mumps and measles or to get married and become parents. The casual way in which many people accepted conversion and church membership as if it was a kind of routine celestial insurance that it was well to have attended to once for all and gotten out of the way as a major issue, was not inspiring to me. In many cases character seemed to be little more affected by salvation than by mumps or marriage. Among the students that I knew I saw little evidence of any such supernatural transformation as conversion assumed.

Sometimes, in my weariness, I took it for granted that I would eventually follow the lines of least resistance, be converted and become a conventional Christian. I did not want to be a Christian but it seemed to be a necessary part of life. It often appeared to be a rather cheap and shoddy substitute for something real, rather than anything real itself. What the reality was that all earnest-minded people were searching for I did not know, but church-religion, as I saw it, did not seem to be a satisfactory route to its attainment.

Some of the best people of my acquaintance had not been converted and never posed as Christian. Their example was a stabilizing influence in my experience.

As time passed and I became familiar with such books as Matthew Arnold's *Literature and Dogma* and Froude's *Short Studies,* it quite suddenly came to me that I need concern myself no more about being converted and saved, since the experiences interpreted as salvation were purely psychological, superinduced by belief in a supernatural scheme of salvation, for which there was no warrant in the natural order of life. The violent and usually short-lived emotional experiences that often accompanied conversion were easily accounted for by the pressure brought to bear upon the convert. No quaver of theological fear or anxiety has disturbed me since I came to these conclusions over half a century ago.

In their testimonies in revival meetings I have heard people dwell upon the wonderful peace and sense of security that came to them when they realized that they had been saved. I can testify that the greatest relief and sense of security that ever came into my life was experienced when I fully realized that I did not need to be saved,—that I had never been lost, that I was an inescapable increment of the living universe, and that I could trust it to take care of me if I functioned properly as an integral part of it.

As theology passed out of the category of serious consideration in my life, religion seemed to mount in importance. Matthew Arnold had defined religion as "morality touched with emotion" and had declared that "conduct is three fourths of life." Why should there not be religious institutions or churches entirely free from dogmatic theology, whose sole function should be to lift morality to emotional heights of contagion and whose primary objective would be the purification and ennoblement of human conduct? It seemed to me that such institutions were sadly needed, and that such an institution would be a congenial working place for persons like myself, who might preach and teach the higher morality unconfused by theological assumptions.

I had become an enthusiastic evolutionist and for a time I was inclined to test every person's enlightenment by his attitude toward evolution. I had learned from Herbert Spencer's *Data of Ethics* that all moral codes and practices, as well as all religious beliefs and ceremonies, were as much products of evolution as were the organs of our bodies, and therefore must necessarily be in a constant state of flux or change.

Here was a grand new gospel, infinitely more comprehensive than any of the gospels of the past. One should not only believe in evolution but one must be an active evolutionist, boosting things along in the way they should go, instead of allowing them to drift in the blind, tragically slow and wasteful way that they had in the past. As man grows in intelligence and cooperative capacity he ceases to be a mere passive creature in the process of evolution but increasingly takes command of the process, hastening it onward.

Another influence pushing me in the same direction was a course of study on "The Great Introspective Masterpieces of the World's Literature" given by a Professor of Literature who was a thorough liberal. He began with the "Book of Job," subjecting it to the same critical analysis as he did "Aeschylus," "Hamlet," "In Memoriam," and *Sartor Resartus.* If "Job" was to be treated that way, why not all other so-called sacred literature? Where was the dividing line between sacred and secular? I decided that there was none.

My studies in history had the same effect; especially a course on the Protestant Reformation. Protestantism, it seemed to me, should have persisted until it reached the logical conclusion of complete private judgment, instead of "aborting" the way it did; emancipating itself from the shackles of a dogmatic church only to encumber itself with dogmatic creeds even more inelastic than the church it had repudiated. I wanted to be

a perpetual protestant; forever protesting against the theological half-truths that were fastening themselves upon us, obscuring the larger truths constantly revealed by increasing enlightenment.

I knew that Harvard University had completely divorced its Divinity School from all church affiliations, making it a graduate school for the scientific study of theology and religion. This was the first time that any school of standing in America had avowedly taken that stand. It was denounced far and wide as "atheistic"; the defenders of the faith assuming, apparently, that divinity should not be subjected to investigation and analysis. I wondered if any theology could survive thoroughgoing, scientific examination!

I had been told that there were creedless churches that required no theological beliefs of members and ministers. I discovered Channing's works and other books of a similar character, as well as a number of tracts published by the American Unitarian Association, stored away in a farm house on the Dakota prairie where I was staying. I read this literature with much interest, learning that the creedless churches were mostly Unitarian and that the Unitarian movement was mainly an outgrowth of the influence of Harvard College, where from the beginning a greater degree of free investigation prevailed than in other schools. I was also surprised to learn how many of the literary, scientific, and historical characters for whom I had great admiration were Unitarian.

I began to wonder if it would be possible for me to study at the Harvard Divinity School with a prospect of qualifying for one of the creedless churches. At first, it seemed like a dream too remote and fantastic for serious consideration. After turning it over in my mind and becoming a little more accustomed to it, I sent for a catalogue, and made inquiries as to whether I could be admitted to the school as a student. I received a very polite reply to the effect that the University of South Dakota, of which I was a graduate, had no standing in the academic world, and consequently I could not be admitted as a regular student. However, if I wished to take the risk, I could come to Cambridge and attend some of the lectures. If it was found that I was able to do the work I might be admitted as a special student, but could not be graduated or be a candidate for a degree. I accepted this as a polite way of turning me down; the inference probably being that one from the wooly haunts of "Wild Bill" and "Sitting Bull" might have too many feathers in his hair for congeniality in the select society of the "effete" East.

As a sequel to my first approach to Harvard I can say that forty years later the Harvard chapter of Phi Beta Kappa initiated me into that scholastic fraternity as an honorary member, acting as agent of the school that had in the first instance been declared to have no academic standing.

Harvard was right in shunting me aside for the time being. I hardly know what the effect of a sudden plunge from the prairies of Dakota into the highly charged Cambridge atmosphere might have had upon me. It was better for me to feel my way a little at a time. My Harvard correspondent wisely advised me to get in touch with The Meadville Theological School, suggesting that it might meet my needs better than Harvard.

The institution referred to was a school for the training of liberal ministers, founded and endowed by a Dutch family that had settled in Western Pennsylvania in an early day. The members of this family believed that complete religious liberty was the solution of all serious problems, and made this school a perpetual contribution to the realization of their ideal.

It followed the lead of the Harvard Divinity School as completely as it could, except in matters of academic standards. No special scholastic requirements were insisted upon. Prospective candidates must convince members of the faculty of their ability to do the work creditably, and that they possessed character compatible with the work of the ministry. No theological tests were required of students and they were free to choose any field of service that appealed to them at the end of their work in the school. Comfortable quarters were provided for students at less than cost; no tuition was charged, and the economic burden placed upon students was small. What more could be asked of any school in the way of freedom and opportunity!

After having turned the matter over in my mind many times and having exchanged several letters with the president, I made the great decision—the most momentous of my life. I decided to cut myself off from the past, travel to a far country, and trust myself to a movement almost unknown to me. I had been telling people for two or three years that "I seem to be more of a Unitarian than anything else," though I had never had an opportunity to attend a Unitarian church service.

What an odyssey that trip was to faraway Pennsylvania! I was leaving behind all of the persons and places I knew. The prairies of South Dakota and Iowa constituted the sum total of my first-hand knowledge of the geography of the world. When I crossed the Mississippi river I felt as if I were entering the domain of ancient history! When I reached Chicago I was fairly overwhelmed with a sense of the permanency of things. It seemed as though those great structures must have always been there. Yet, at that time—1895—men and women were living in Chicago whose memory antedated the first shanty erected on that windy lakeside. As a matter of fact, Chicago—the Indian name for "wild onion patch"—was founded the year my father was born, and he was then a venerable sage of sixty-two.

I embarked upon this strange and, as it often seemed to me, fantastic adventure entirely on my own initiative and responsibility. I sometimes had difficulty in convincing myself of its reality. I did not dare to ask advice, knowing well enough that I would receive only discouragement. I knew then, as well as I do now, that I did not possess a single one of the supposedly essential qualifications for the ministry. I had no social gifts or graces, which then as now were considered the first and most important requisites. I was shy and shrinking almost to the point of paralysis when in the company of more than two or three. By no stretch of the imagination could I be called a good mixer. I have always disliked institutionalism and organization, and have shunned administrative responsibilities and activities, though recognizing a limited need for them. I was completely ignorant of the inner workings of a church society, never having participated in church work of any kind. Last, but not least, I had no religion at all, in the sense in which that word is almost universally used, nor did I want any. Conventional forms of worship were distasteful to me.

My seeking admission to a theological school under such conditions was certainly an amazing piece of effrontery. I regarded the experiment as highly

adventurous on my part. I hardly dared speculate on the possible outcome. Yet, never was I more desperately in earnest about anything in my life. I hoped that I might be able to do something that apparently no one had ever done before. And I did it! I became a fairly successful minister, without possessing any of the qualifications that are almost universally regarded as essential for church work.

My expectations as to what I should find in the school were hazy, but I was in a mood to make the best of what I found. I was tremendously anxious to find a satisfactory and reasonably congenial life work, but I was not looking for an easy berth. I was willing to pay for what I received from life, by giving all that I had in return.

I was not disposed to find fault with the subjects taught, nor with the way they were treated. Theology was for the most part exhibited to us as interesting fossil remains of extinct systems of religion, from which we could learn much in seeking a religion for ourselves. The Bible—especially the Old Testament—was taught as geology was; the various strata, formations, deposits, outcroppings, upheavals, and erosions were traced out in minute detail. Higher Criticism was in the full swing of its analytical career and was often carried to excess. Now, Bible literature is taught on broader lines of purely human interest and usefulness.

Church history, as taught by the able and enthusiastic young man who had recently come to the school, became human history. The search for a better life, and the beliefs and practices that would lead to it, was the wheat that he was always winnowing out of the chaff of ecclesiastical controversy. Theology was brought down to earth and transmuted into such humanistic subjects as psychology, sociology, and ethics.

The school had a good library with much non-theological material in it. I devoured Renan's voluminous works, *Bible for Learners,* and books of that kind, getting my bearings in Bible religion well established, early in my course.

The lecture system of teaching was overdone in this school as it was everywhere at that time. Students were not afforded sufficient opportunities for self-expression. The Methodist practice of learning to preach by preaching and learning to administer by administering could not be put into vogue in liberal churches to any great extent at that time.

The three years at Meadville were the most satisfying of any like period of my life up to that time. I was pursuing the studies I wanted to pursue, learning the things I most wanted to learn, and was in congenial surroundings. For the first time in my life I experienced the startling sensation of being in an atmosphere where heresy was orthodox! One was more likely to be tried for orthodoxy than for heresy so far as the student body was concerned.

No tiresome uniformity existed in the small student body. Far from it. It was a heterogeneous aggregation that came out of a wide variety of experiences and environments. Many of them had individual convictions which they were ready to defend against all comers on all occasions. The more bumptious and belligerent ones usually either soon toned down or took their departure when they found that they could not set the school aright.

Some of the students leaned strongly toward orthodoxy. They wished to be as regular and respectable as it was possible for heretics to be. Others loathed all of the orthodoxies and had an exaggerated conception of freedom. There were many "isms" in the "gay nineties." They were all represented among the students, but were not barbed by war conditions as they are now.

Mental tensions were tremendous in many lives. Two of the student body committed suicide while I was there—both brilliant men. One cut the Gordian knot of entangled convictions in his own room in the school. The other returned to his home town before ending the inner conflict. Such a state is almost normal on the frontiers of life where men and women have cut themselves loose from all authoritative moorings and are trying to navigate the stormy seas of life on their own responsibilities. The trouble is not that they are without chart and compass, as is often asserted, but that so many confusing charts are thrust upon them that they are completely bewildered.

While those three years of training were stimulating and satisfying in many respects, they were anxious years nevertheless, the anxiety intensifying as the end approached. I entered the school with a full appreciation of my lack of qualifications for the ministry, but fervently hoping that three years might work a marvelous transformation. To youth, three years seem like eternity, and nothing is too great to hope for in that time. Alas, no transformation seemed to be occurring! My disqualifications stuck, and I was more painfully aware of them as the crucial hour of trial approached. I was fearful that I might find myself farther out into nowhere at the end of my course than at the beginning. I knew people who spent their lives flitting from one educational institution to another; always preparing to do something and never doing it. Was that to be my lot! Was I to become an educational degenerate! What a fate! A sense of my own disqualifications was not the only thing that disturbed me. The way many liberal churches conformed in their service of worship to the usage and language of traditional Christianity jarred upon me from the beginning of my acquaintance with them. I have never ceased to be amazed at the complacency with which many liberal ministers often contradict in their sermons what they unctuously affirm in their services of worship, apparently being unconscious of the conflict. I confess to a certain amount of guilt in my own practices in this respect, but I was painfully aware of it. Worship has always been a source of unhappiness to me.

While still in the school I was greedily reading the publications of the Ethical Culture societies. The Ethical movement was dynamic at that time. The lecturers were young men who were reaching out in all directions, full of hope, and sure that the Ethical movement had a great future. Their utterances were meat and drink to me, satisfying me as did nothing else that was currently available. As is the case with many institutions, after the flush of the first generation of enthusiastic effort was over, the Ethical movement seemed to lose some of its nascent energy. It became almost reactionary, assuming that Felix Adler had delivered the final message; the lecturers becoming defenders of the faith once for all enunciated by their great leader. Many Unitarians have become still more reactionary, assuming that the nineteenth century Unitarians gave the ultimate and final message for mankind, and bitterly resenting any and all departures from the faith once delivered.

I expressed doubts as to my qualifications to the

youngest member of the faculty, asking him if he thought I could serve a church acceptably either to the congregation or myself, when I was really not a churchman but a secular ethical culturist. He replied that, judging by the sermons he had heard me give in the chapel and elsewhere, he thought that I was exceptionally well qualified so far as preaching was concerned. He said that it would not be easy, but if I used reasonably good judgment, preaching what I did believe and not worrying too much about what I did not believe, I might get along quite well. He suggested that perhaps I might let the congregation decide what it wanted in the way of worship. He told me that I need not expect to be free from doubt and conflict in my own mind—conscientious, reflective persons never were.

Somewhat to my surprise and greatly to my relief, several invitations to candidate came to me near the close of school. I selected a church with a good reputation in a little town in Iowa. I knew the background of life in that part of the world and hoped that would be an advantage. I gave my first sermon in Humboldt while the decisive battle of the Spanish-American war was being fought, off the coast of Cuba. I remained in the community two weeks, meeting the people in various capacities. Soon after my departure, a congregational meeting was held, and I was unanimously invited to become the minister. I accepted without delay, and the next five years were spent in that community—five very busy years, rich in experience, profitable to me beyond compare, and I think in no way detrimental to the interests of the church.

I did not begin my ministry until, in conversation with the president of the society, I had told him in "fear and trembling" that I had no settled convictions concerning God and immortality that I could preach with assurance. I asserted that I was tremendously interested in life and all of its infinite possibilities; that "the more abundant life" would always be the theme of my preaching and teaching. Greatly to my relief and satisfaction he replied that he was glad to hear me state it that way, and he thought such preaching and teaching would be well received in the church and community.

During forty consecutive years in the ministry, following that interview, I doubtless wobbled often and was subject to not a few vagaries, but I did not swerve much from the objective I set for myself in the beginning. I have always tried to make my church a school of life.

What Stake in Capitalism?

LEO HIRSCH

He who has a regard for ethics in his approach to certain ends may be called a dreamer, but actually he is the true realist. He who has no concern over the means by which he tries to reach his ends is not as practical as he thinks he is. Emerson summed it up quite clearly when he said: "The end pre-exists in the means."

The world today faces catastrophe, because of faulty leadership in the past. Leadership that was could neither prevent nor predict the present crisis and is directly implicated in the present emergency. Yet, the likes of these same leaders, who failed in yesteryear, are determined to pursue after the war the same ends they did prior to it.

They call their goal Free Enterprise. They do not define it clearly except by implied threat, saying: "Hands off, we can take care of our own affairs!" This was the process that enabled the Nazis to deify the state and dehumanize the individual.

Is Free Enterprise the supreme goal of democracy, or is it democracy's business to develop better human beings?

Does Free Enterprise mean freedom to exploit workers and ultimate consumers? Does Free Enterprise mean unemployment and inequality? Does it mean the destruction of the National Labor Relations Act and the Wage and Hour Act? Its very vocal proponents have been combating these two pieces of social legislation with tenacity and bitterness almost unparalleled in our history. Does Free Enterprise mean the creation of the super-trust to collaborate with the International German Cartels by limiting the public use of inventions?

Undoubtedly, as Mr. Eric A. Johnston proclaims, capitalism has solved most of the problems of mass production. But it shies away from the problem of equitable distribution. Mr. Johnston would say: "That is not industry's problem." He claims that the old capitalism is dead. Is it? Has it shown itself to be the savior of mankind during the past three decades? Has it accepted the responsibility of cleaning its Augean stables? Where was it hiding during the ten years of depression? Has it solved any of the perplexing problems that brought about the depression as well as the war?

Much of today's suffering stems from the violation by industrialists and financiers the world over of the eternal principles by which human life is governed. In 1929, our national economy broke down. Hoover's government did the least governing, it kept hands off. "Let the law of economics take its course," he said. Through three years of this, things got worse. The industrialists and financiers were imploring the government to do something.

In 1933, a new government stepped in. Roosevelt's New Deal set the prostrate banks going, kept the life insurance companies and railroads from bankruptcy, fed the starving unemployed, made jobs for the workless, and by many measures started the wheels of the nation's economy going again. This assuredly was more, not less, government.

In our country, government limitation on Free Enterprise started with the Constitution or before.

Traffic lights, railroad safety devices, drivers' licenses, food laws, regulation of Wall Street and the public utilities, regulation of business and health, we all put up with now. From the beginning, there has been more and more government. There had to be, to protect the people from too much private government and free enterprise.

Mr. Johnston received national prominence when *The Reader's Digest* published his article on the great

stake every American has in capitalism. Mr. Henry J. Kaiser immediately backed him up and advertised the gist of that article in page advertisements throughout the country. Behold, American workingmen and ultimate consumers all have a real stake in capitalism! Our old sins of rugged individualism are gone with the wind—with the war! Why then the charges in the halls of Congress where a steel corporation has to defend itself against the accusation of furnishing faulty armor plate to the Navy? Or the charges that the controlling managements of the Aluminum Corporation, the National Lead Co., the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, and the General Electric Co. were ready to collaborate with the German I. G. Farbenindustrie. It was through these Cartels, operated by German and American interests, that the Nazis were able to build up their tremendous war machine. "The Farbenindustrie" was Hitler and Hitler was "the Farbenindustrie," supplying the Nazi listening posts throughout the world. Our Free Enterprising leaders put business considerations before the welfare of their nation. Yes, look at the dollar-a-year men working so hard in Washington to secure 95 per cent of the government war contracts for their own corporations. Examine how these corporate magnates padded their expenses by increasing their salaries during 1942. Look at the poor coal operators who are putting the entire blame of the coal strike on the miners and their reckless leader. How better to make people forget that the miners have grievances. The showing of the coal mining industry is indeed a tragic picture of Free Enterprise. It is a concrete example of the basic evil of private ownership of natural resources intent only on exploiting the productive forces of the country, not for the public welfare but for the private gain of the owners.

Mr. Johnston, speaking of Russia, says: "We do not want their social set-up introduced within our own country." As if to say that our own social and economic system is so perfect, that there is nothing we can do or want to learn from the Russian system. There is one thing that Mr. Johnston and those he represents will have to learn from Russia, and that is that all natural resources—the mines, the oil wells, water power, as well as all public utilities—will have to be socialized. No individual, no group of individuals, is smart or unselfish enough to administer these productive forces for the public welfare. No individual and no minority group should have the right to own these resources in which every one has an equal right. How can every individual have a stake in capitalism when capitalism will not relinquish its grip on the private ownership of natural resources? This grip fundamentally means inequality, insecurity, and enslavement. Private ownership of the socially important properties is anti-democratic and should be prohibited. These should be used for the needs of all the people—to lift their standard of living, so that they can work and create with enthusiasm. We cannot afford to leave our mineral wealth in the hands of private enterprise. Our future depends upon how skillfully we can husband our natural resources. They are too precious to be left in the control of interests that think in terms of immediate gain.

The T.V.A. is the pioneer government project that is showing us the way to democratize social control. It must not be abandoned. It is the measuring rod for all public utilities and has shown up the selfish managers and owners of our utilities in bold relief. Private ownership of natural resources and public utilities is the basic cause of the supreme power of our monopolies. While the physical set-up of the T.V.A. is confined to seven southern states, its influence is spreading "round the world." When peace comes, T.V.A. ideas will leap the oceans to provide a basis of power development throughout the world. It portrays something really new, something on which, after the war, we can build a better future. It plays an important part in the everyday life of the people. It provides cheap electric power for home, farm, and manufacturing use; it gives the farmers concentrated phosphates and nitrates for cheap fertilizer to assure greater food production; and it increases greater inland river traffic at a low cost. If we make intelligent use of all our natural resources, as we are doing at T.V.A., then modern technology will chart the road to universal welfare and peace. Then mankind will have the means with which every nation and region in the world can build industries and raise living standards. The fierce struggle for foreign markets and raw materials will end, and thus remove the basic causes of imperialism and war.

Does Mr. Johnston believe that the American people are so gullible as to accept his statement that every individual has a stake in capitalism? People know that no longer does our political government wield the power of social control. That power has gone over to the large corporations. They dominate the economic life of our nation as they dominate the economic life of Germany.

Corporate policy and actions resulting therefrom are laid down by lawyers representing corporate management. They do not represent the stockholders or the workers. That is not what they are hired for. Their aim is to give the management the widest possible latitude both in managing the business, which is one thing, and in dealing with the financial set-up, which is quite another. The management almost always expects to make a fortune for itself and its associates, by dealing with the corporate set-up: they and their bankers together. The public and the workers are not cut in. The result has been to give management virtually a blank check on all the corporate assets, leaving them to fill out the amount and the time of payment. The corporate chessboard of today permits a corporate management to apportion the underlying values in the corporation, as it chooses, on the one hand; and to take the underlying values entirely out of the stockholders' hands and present them to others. Corporate managements are rapidly acquiring, where they do not already have, the same significance which used to be held in medieval England by the dukes and earls and the landed aristocracy. Through legal maneuvering they have acquired power to deal very nearly as they choose with corporate values; they have likewise acquired a position in which almost the only thing which can be done with savings is to hand over such savings to one or another corporate management in the hope of interest or dividends; and in which the market value of such securities is represented by a market quotation which the management can itself influence whenever it chooses. The law, though it exercises some control, is not a remedy for most of us and is, at best, expensive and hazardous.

Does Mr. Johnston in his call for Free Enterprise reveal that the widows and orphans lost ten billions of dollars in railroad securities alone during the past two and one-half decades? What the public lost in public utility holding companies and their wholly owned and

controlled utilities, no one knows, but it reaches into the billions.

Did Mr. Johnston reveal to the stakeholders how the New Capitalism defines a "fair wage"? That is basic to the creation of a livable post-war world. He has not answered this. The group he represents will never admit that from a standpoint of justice and equity there is such a thing as a "fair wage." A fair wage to a capitalist is the least you can hire a man for. Has our present economy ever seriously attempted to clarify this basic problem according to the underlying principles of democracy? Among employers there is no agreement as to what constitutes a fair wage. They evade the issue, because low wages provide the main cause of exploitation.

It is too easy for us to blame our present woes on the satanic influence of Hitler. It would be better to admit the principle of mutualism which recognizes the guilt of all of us. Hitler is not the cause of our troubles; he is but the expression of a disease known as German Imperialism or Pan-Germanism.

The germ of imperialism does not only exist in Germany. It exists in England as well as in our own country. It is not merely an ingredient of our present economic system; it is the system itself.

Senator George put a realistic appraisal on our own situation in a recent speech before the U. S. Chamber of Commerce, the organization of which Mr. Johnston is the head. He said:

> Plainly stated, it is that our system of free economy is through; that it cannot provide the consumptive demand which will enable it to produce at a rate and on a scale sufficient to provide constant employment. Let it be clearly understood that *government responsibility* in the economic field *will increase* rather than decline in the post-war period; that government control will be exerted as it has not been exerted in the past to correct the abuses in our highly complex economic system. In short, that the private enterprise system is not at an end, but that back of it are people with privileges and rights to be preserved, and that, above all, human values must be conserved.

Senator George sees our present system as done for. It was done for before the war. We had fifteen millions unemployed for a very long period. Mr. Johnston does not see it that way. He does not dare see the truth. However pleasant it may be for the vast majority, for him it will be a bitter dose, and he cannot take it. His school of thought does not see that modern institutions are undergoing as great a change as medievalism underwent at the time of the transition. The changes today occur more rapidly. War has increased the tempo.

In my judgment, our economy will either have to be drastically revised to meet the present human needs or it will have to be replaced by a cooperative, managerial economy for human use and service, introducing real efficiency in control and distribution. The new social economy will have to be both efficient and just.

Despite Mr. Johnston's resentment against governmental interference in Free Enterprise, it seems to the writer that parallel with the enlargement of the suffrage and the *vast extension of the scope of government,* there has been not a decline but a *steady growth in public honesty.*

The many pieces of social legislation sponsored and carried through by the Roosevelt administration have done much to stop the flagrant abuses within the framework of our present economic system. Let us pay our appreciative tribute to the many devoted servants in the various departments of our government who are performing outstanding services without any flare and without any high salaries, such as our corporate magnates demand for equal services. This growth may eventually encourage the growth of honesty in our business life. Despite this fine example in our public life, we still hold, in our economic life, to the belief that the determination of the good of an entire community or nation can be left safely in the hands of a self-appointed oligarchy whose main purpose is to enjoy the gain and power of their position. Is that any different from Pan-Germanism and Hitlerism?

It behooves us to remember a principle which guided our Founding Fathers: that the only just power of political government springs from the consent of the governed. But now it needs to be extended into the field of economics, covering every phase of industry, commodities, and services. If we believe in constitutionalism in our political life, why should it not be equally good in our economic life?

Let us not be deceived by Mr. Johnston's argument. He would like us to believe that capitalism and democracy are synonymous—that they are one and the same thing. Let us be clear about the differentiation. Capitalism, like Fascism and Communism, is an *ism* with a definite economic theory behind it. Like all isms, it is dogmatic and static. On the other hand, democracy is not a system but a *principle of growth* that forever must remain an unfinished task. It rests on the long experience of the race that men do not grow, learn, and create except when they are free. Capitalism up to now has lived on greed, exploitation, insecurity, and inequality. Democracy, whose basic principles are freedom and inviolability of personality, must be made free from exploitation, want, and insecurity. Democracy is dynamic because of its endless possibilities of development. Like science, it believes in trial and error. The basic freedoms which democracy incorporates are never achieved. They are constantly in the process of achievement—they must forever remain the Holy Grail. Mr. Johnston and his followers are determined to perpetuate capitalism with its grave limitations; they want to renew the life of a faulty social order that has given us the destruction of individual worth and endless wars.

If we believe in Free Enterprise, then let it be free of exploitation and in harmony with the basic principles of democracy and we ought to look upon it only as a means to achieve a great goal. The dedication must be to the ideals of democracy. Can that consecration be better expressed than it was by the late President Theodore Roosevelt in his eloquent address at Carnegie Hall on March 20, 1912?

> Our task as Americans is to strive for social and industrial justice, achieved through the genuine rule of the people. This is our end, our purpose. The methods for achieving the end are merely expedients to be finally accepted or rejected, according as actual experience shows that they work well or ill. But in our hearts we must have this lofty purpose and we must strive for it in all earnestness and sincerity or our work will come to nothing.
>
> If on this new continent we merely build another country of great but unjustly divided material prosperity, we shall have done nothing; and we shall do as little if we merely set the greed of envy against the greed of arrogance, and thereby destroy the well-being of all of us. To turn this government into government by plutocracy or government by a mob would be to repeat on a larger scale the lamentable failures of the world that is dead. We stand against all tyranny, by the few or by the many. We stand for the rule of the many in the interest of all of us, for the rule of the many in the spirit of courage, of common sense, of high purpose; above all, in a spirit of kindly justice towards every man and every woman.

Religion, Not Race, the Basis of Judaism

ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

There has appeared in UNITY in recent years, as in other magazines, many articles dealing with the so-called "Jewish problem." As a matter of fact the Jewish problem is a human one growing out of man's stupidity and ignorance. Almost all of these articles are based on the theory that there is a race of Jews, with peculiar innate qualities, which distinguish them from the rest of mankind. Many writers assume that this race has certain physical characteristics common to all its members. The continued insistence, on the part of those who call themselves Jews and those who do not, of these two utterly fallacious ideas only makes the problem more difficult.

All intelligent persons, especially those who discuss the Jewish problem ought to know that the idea of a Jewish race is not supported by any reputable anthropologist. The idea of a pure race, that is a race that is marked off from other peoples by characteristics peculiar to that race, is without the slightest scientific basis. "This is true of Africa as it is of Europe. In fact," says Felix Von Luschan, one of the greatest of the German anthropologists, "the natives of Africa, who were considered not long ago to be a homogeneous mass, now turn out to be a most complicated mixture of quite different elements, the outcome of immigration at different periods and from different parts of the globe." No recognized anthropologist affirms the existence of a European or even a white race.

It is true that in the past ethnic groups have appeared with certain physical characteristics in common. But these groups were merged with other groups. This process went on for hundreds of thousands of years and still goes on.

But there is not the slightest evidence in all this process that there ever appeared any group with mental characteristics that set them above or below the rest of mankind.

The people who are called Jews are recognized by all anthropologists as one of the most mixed groups in the Western world. The author of a book on anti-Semitism says that this word is a misnomer. Whatever may have been the ethnic origins of the tribesmen who invaded Palestine more than three thousand years ago, their contribution to the group now called Jews is infinitesimal. No people could set up their Lares and Penates on the main highway of the ancient world and expect to remain a "pure race." From the time of Esdras, about 450 B.C., until well into the Christian era, the Jews were a religious proselyting group. The Kingdom of Israel and the Kingdom of Judah have disappeared. But the Jewish religion has remained. Religion, not race, unites the people called Jews. By the farthest stretch of the imagination, the Jews of Asia, Africa, Europe, and the Americas cannot be said to be "a race."

But, it is urged, there are "Jewish characteristics." I very much doubt if there are any of these characteristics that are not in some measure shared by other groups. These are, however, of sociological and not of ethnic origin. All religious groups that claim to have the true revelation, as well as all who suffer persecution, develop certain traits in common. Even as the slaves in the Roman Empire were united by their sufferings, so the Jews have been united by the relentless persecutions on the part of so-called Christians. And the Jew who would escape from his group has been thrust back into it by the cruel and unreasoning attitude of the dominant group. Nothing is more absurd today in our inherited patterns of thought than our insistence that if a person is born of Jewish parents he must always be a Jew.

We say that Jews are clannish, but this attitude makes them so. It is true that Jewish religious leaders support this attitude. They fear that it will result in the loss of Jewish culture. But all that is of value in this culture has already been made a part of Western culture. What the Jew has given to the world can no more be lost than Greek culture. When Jews and non-Jews frankly face the fact that Judaism represents not a race but a religion, and that a Jew can forsake his religion even as a Catholic or a Protestant can, we will be on the way of banishing the Jewish problem from our midst. Then such articles as "I Married a Jew" and "The Ordeal of the Jew" will cease to be written.

The Study Table

Vilification of Thomas Paine

CITIZEN TOM PAINE. *By Howard Fast. New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce. 341 pp. $2.75.*

Here is a strange book—strange to the point of being sensational! It is offered to the public as a novelized biography of the great Thomas Paine, based on accurate historical information. What it is in effect is one more attempt to abuse Paine in his unknown grave, and revive all those old calumnies and slanders which had in recent years so largely disappeared. The deliberate vilification of Paine, in the century following his death, remains of course one of the outstanding literary disgraces of all time. Because Paine dared to attack and expose supernatural Christianity in his *Age of Reason,* which anticipated and prepared the way for the liberal religion of our time, nothing was too vile to say of him. He was clothed with every weakness and vice that flesh is heir to. Before he died, this monstrous work of defamation had begun, and the sheer greatness of the man and his immeasurable services to this nation were largely ignored and forgotten. But in recent years new and accurate biographies of Thomas Paine have appeared and the task of rehabilitation has thus been far advanced. A whole generation has arisen which knows nothing of the hideous slanders which have dogged Paine's memory so persistently. And now the dead ashes are raked over again, and all the old lies exposed anew. If ever there was a ghoulish piece of business, this is it.

In seeking a motivation for Mr. Fast's abominable work, I shrink from the idea of sheer wickedness on his part. There are too many indications in the book

that he admires Paine, and admires him greatly, to make this suggestion plausible. Rather I am inclined to believe that he was betrayed by the familiar artistic device of painting a dark background in order to set off the more brilliantly a resplendent figure. He persuaded himself that Paine's greatness as a champion of liberty would appear the more remarkable if placed in striking contrast to his alleged failings as a man. But what shall we say about the matter of historic fact? Mr. Fast makes Paine an utterly loathsome and despicable creature. He presents him as dirty, unwashed, unshaven, an incorrigible drunkard, a foul-mouthed blasphemer, a wretched libertine. His person is described throughout in terms of utter disgust and horror. There was no depth too low for this man to tumble into, no practice too vile for him to make it the habit of his life. Yet all this is mere fiction of the worst type. These lies have been exposed again and again. Mr. Fast's book is frankly a novel, but does this justify such an utterly villainous picture of a man who is now known to have been a hero whose stature as a person was commensurate with his stature as a historical character of vast importance?

How preposterous all this is, is shown convincingly in the opening pages of Mr. Fast's book, which have to do with the famous interview with Benjamin Franklin which resulted in Paine's going to America with Franklin's introduction and friendly sponsorship. Paine is described at this interview as a dirty, hook-nosed man, with "twisted eyes tight with bitterness and resentment." His "whiskers were a week on his face, and he needed washing." He is again and again said to be "impudent," "defiant," disrespectful to the great Doctor Franklin. He draws up his toes into his "battered shoes"; he takes out of his pocket "a handful of dirty bills." On this occasion we are asked to believe that "Paine was a little drunk and tired, his sharp head rocking forward, his twisted eyes closing, the whole of him, wretched clothes and dirty skin and beard, and curious pointed features making a disturbing enigma. . . ." And it is "this dirty raggle-taggle," as Mr. Fast calls him, whom Franklin sends to America with a letter commending him as "very well recommended to me as an ingenious, worthy young man." Who recommended such a ruffian—and who was Franklin to be persuaded in such fashion?

The situation becomes the more amazing when it is remembered that Paine was not only the foster son of Franklin, so to speak, but for years the friend and intimate of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Rush, and other revolutionary notables. And most of the time while he was the trusted associate of these men, he was, so we are told, drinking like a sot, wearing filthy clothes, and flourishing dirty finger-nails, behaving like an abandoned rake and vagabond. How explain the curious intervals when he was sober, and wearing faultless linen? Above all, how explain the confidence reposed in Paine, even at his alleged word, by the most distinguished and reputable personages of his time?

This book is not wholly bad. There is an unforgettable description of the printing of *Common Sense,* and its distribution through the colonies as the pamphlet which persuaded the colonists to independence. There are many picturesque pages about Paine's life in revolutionary France, especially the famous interview with Napoleon. The period in England, when Paine wrote the *Rights of Man,* is hurriedly treated, but the story of the last days in America has pathos and tragedy. But on the whole, this work on Paine must be condemned. I count it regrettable that it should have been written, and incredible that it should have been praised by more than one reviewer.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Goodness Without Power

RELIGION OF TOMORROW. *By John Elof Boodin. New York: Philosophical Library. 189 pp. $2.50.*

In which traditional evangelical theology is effectively criticized; but in which God emerges as merely "pervasive energy stimulating toward the best," and man "by being compounded with the divine energy" reaches "a new and higher unity of life." Perhaps Boodin has done the best that can be achieved in the tradition of a finite God; in the effort to free God from responsibility from evil; in trying to make the God-ideal acceptable to the modern mind; and in providing emotional stimulus for pious people. In attempting to escape irrationalism and impersonalism, he appears to abandon the effort to find an inclusive theology. This may suit modernists, but it will hardly satisfy those who want a God of *both* goodness and power.

CURTIS W. REESE.

Message of Hope—or Counsel of Despair?

THE CONSPIRACY OF THE CARPENTERS. *By Hermann Borchardt. Foreword by Franz Werfels. New York: Simon Schuster. 634 pp. $2.75.*

I cannot pretend to have read this book, nor even that I understand it. It is a huge tome, awkwardly composed and badly written. Originally set down as an epic poem, it might better perhaps have remained in that form. But Werfels thinks it a great novel, and his opinion is entitled to profound respect.

In essence, the book is an allegory, with a thinly disguised Germany as its setting. Its theme is the evil of material progress, and the doom that inevitably awaits it. The country in which the story is laid has reached an hour of terrific political and industrial crisis. On the one hand are the great industrialists, owners of mines, factories, and banks, who have subdued the land to their control. At the head of these forces is old Adam Faust, a conservative aristocrat, shrewd, wily, ruthless, who understands clearly the nature of the impending struggle. The author seems to suggest that he is all that the leaders of the former German Republic were not. On the other side are the forces of disruption, led by a Doctor Urban, a demagogue of the Hitler type, false, unscrupulous, dangerous. In between are the Carpenters, a kind of medieval guild of hand and brain workers who see the moral failure of the industrialists, the fatal complexity and inner emptiness of the machine age, and would return to the primitive Christian idea of simple brotherhood sustained by honest labor. The Carpenters would rescue the individual man from being swallowed up and lost in the weltering mass of modern life, and restore his dignity and security in the old principle of Christian love.

The crisis of the story is the attempt of Doctor Urban to organize his revolutionary forces and seize all power. President Faust understands that there is no arguing with this false Messiah, no reasoning with him in terms of appeasement. As the condition of any salvation for the land, Doctor Urban and his movement must be destroyed. And there must be no shilly-shallying about it. The devil must be fought with fire—met and anni-

hilated by the weapons of force to which he himself has resorted. And so there is civil war, in which the Carpenters throw all their power on the side of the state. This clean-up job has to be done, before there can come the new order of peace and justice.

As a story, the *Conspiracy of the Carpenters* is confused, overladen with poorly prepared episodes, and crowded with ill-defined characters. It has a complexity which seems to suggest the hopeless confusion of the social system which it derides. As an allegory, its meaning is altogether uncertain. The indictment of the present day conservative classes seems to be plain. But has labor succeeded or failed? Must our whole machine civilization be abandoned, and resort be had to the guild system of the Middle Ages? Is Doctor Borchardt's Utopia a true return to Christian principles, or the imposition of a disguised Fascism? Is the whole book a message of hope, or a counsel of despair? A more careful study than I have been able to give to this work may uncover the answers to these questions, but I must in honesty confess that I have not found them.

Only one thing seems crystal clear, and that is that there can be no place in modern life for demagogues of the Hitler type, or revolutionary movements of the Nazi variety. Here Doctor Borchardt's own experience as a German refugee stands him in good stead. But it is horrifying, to this reader at least, to note with what perfect confidence he visualizes the struggle against demagoguery in terms of unsparing force and violence. Adam Faust stops at nothing in his fight against Doctor Urban, and the Christian carpenters are his willing confreres. It never seems to enter into the author's head that force and guile have their own inherent dangers, and that war is itself the antithesis of Christian idealism. What a choice, between Faust and Urban, for the destiny of the future!

But in all this I may be wrong. I may have missed something—perhaps much. I am very likely misreading Doctor Borchardt's text. My excuse must be that the author gives all too little help to his readers in understanding what it is all about.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

The Yale Lectures

PREACHING THE WORD OF GOD. *By Morgan Phelps Noyes. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 219 pp. $2.00.*

One of the benefactors of American culture of whom we hear little is Henry Williams Sage, the founder of the Lyman Beecher Lectures on Preaching for Yale University. Mr. Sage used his money, which he earned largely in the lumber business, as a sacred trust for American cultural life. As a friend of Ezra Cornell, he endowed Cornell University, where Sage Chapel is named for him. To perpetuate his interest in philosophy and religion he endowed the Sage School of Philosophy at Cornell. In 1857 he moved to Brooklyn, and his intimate friendship for Henry Ward Beecher began. For a number of years he was connected with the work of Plymouth Church, and to perpetuate his regard for Beecher he established, May 2, 1872, the popularly called Yale Lectures on Preaching.

Doctor Noyes had the honor to be invited to give the sixty-sixth series in these famous lectures in which noted scholars both from Europe and America have participated. He chose for his subject his own experience in the pastoral office. In great modesty he explains that he merely tries to interpret the Gospel. This, of course, is the very object Mr. Sage had in mind when he established the foundation.

The importance of this book lies in the tendencies which Doctor Noyes finds in the pastoral work of today. One of these is the tendency toward a unified Christianity. He relates the interesting account of the much exaggerated Doctor Johnson who on his tour of the Hebrides consented to be present at Presbyterian prayers to the "pleasing surprise" of Boswell. Doctor Noyes thinks we have gone a long way from the famous Doctor Johnson. The book is written in a pleasing style, with a wealth of literary references. His final conclusion is that preaching is not talking *about* the possibilities that lie in the Christian religion, but talking *with* people about them.

C. A. HAWLEY.

Correspondence

Relative Virtues

TO UNITY:

Just a few words anent Mr. Yarros' "psychopathic malignity" picture of our inhuman human family. It strikes me as a bit too sweeping compared with his roseate painting of the almost immaculate virtues of the United Nations part of the family. Alone, perhaps the picture would not be too dark, for surely the enormity of the Nazi crimes could hardly be exaggerated. But surely the virtues of the United Nations can be exaggerated and their vices much minimized and are so being. The failure to recognize this may turn any military victory we may win to final defeat. So when Mr. Yarros assures us that "we Americans do not shoot down helpless men in this war," that "our record all through this war has been most creditable," that "we are fully aware of our shortcomings," and that "it is not intelligent to deny we are better than the Nazis" I find many question marks obtruding.

Even Mr. Yarros does not claim that the United Nations are guiltless and admits that they have a few minor imperfections, vices; but the implication is that they are mere motes in the eye, and surely we have no monstrous "beams" as have the Fascists or Nazis that must be "plucked" or bombed out, and so it is quite the thing to "thank the Lord we are not as other men." But are we sure about this? It is a rather large order, for when we say "we Americans" that must include at least our political, industrial, and economic lords and leaders, for they are the powers that really control and decide our national deeds and destiny. Do we really believe that our national vices are mere "motes" that we shall easily rid ourselves of when the Nazi and Fascist monsters in the far corners of the earth are crushed?

When we consider the sources and contributory causes of the comparatively recent upsurge of that scourge we call Fascism or Nazism which may be found in our subtle, slowly disintegrating imperial, capitalist economic institutions and also in the failure of our capitalist and imperial leaders in the time of "the great illusion," or the first World War, to make good their promises to end war and bring democracy and peace on earth, and verified by their continued and oft-repeated betrayals of democracy at the League, in Czechoslovakia, Spain, and in many other crises—it is difficult not to believe that the blunders and crimes of the Allied Nations have been sadly minimized and their virtues magnified.

Has not every one of the United Nations been infected with the same Fascist disease, committted in greater or less degree the same crimes—race persecution, exploitation, betrayal of democracy, ruthless brutality? It seems to me that if, while

bombing Fascist dragons abroad, we hide, belittle, and coddle our home-grown Fascism, all our bombing and slaughter will avail little until we crush the more subtle dragons, within our own borders.

Seattle, Washington. ARTHUR D. WEAGE.

Co-Pilot

TO UNITY:

Noting the criticism made by John Haynes Holmes, in the October issue of UNITY, of the lugging of the name of God into this war, and his reference to the title of the book, *God Is My Co-Pilot,* I would cite the answer to a similar criticism in the *Cleveland Plain Dealer.* The critic thought it would have been more becoming in the author to make God the pilot and to take the second place himself as co-pilot. The answer was that when there are two pilots they are both co-pilots, which gives God at least an even break.

That a trained pilot might feel he knows more about flying than the Almighty does not seem so strange when we remember that two great men of the Bible felt free to criticize God in matters of right conduct, which is supposed to be God's specialty, while flying a plane perhaps is not. Abraham rebuked the Lord in the matter of destroying the righteous with the wicked in Sodom, arguing "Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?" Moses, sickened by the slaughter of the worshippers of the golden calf, said: "Turn from thy fierce wrath and repent of this evil against thy people . . . if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written."

The use of the name of God in war (and in peace) today reminds me of the answer made by Edgar Saltus years ago to the question of what he considered the most interesting character in modern fiction. His answer was "God."

Cumberland, Ohio. MAY STRANATHAN.

Pacifist Terms

TO UNITY:

I am glad to see that Doctor Holmes has answered the two questions that I ventured to put to him—and the Philadelphia Quakers—in the July issue of UNITY. The answers, however, are rather general, and not all readers of UNITY may have grasped their full significance and all their practical implications. May I translate them into concrete terms?

The pacifists would negotiate now with the enemy powers, or their governments—that is, they would have our government propose the immediate opening of peace negotiations and at the same time state the terms of a just and enduring peace. The terms that Doctor Holmes holds to be "basic to universal peace and cooperation" manifestly include the following: The withdrawal of all enemy forces, in Europe and Asia, from the territories that they took by force and have occupied and ruled by terror; the relinquishment of all claims by Germany and Japan, as well as by their satellites, to territory that never belonged to them, or which they acquired by aggressive warfare and to which they have no moral right; the liquidation of the Nazi-Fascist regimes, which are world nuisances and must remain such by reason of the barbarous and insane character of the ideas they rest upon—the master-race idiocy, anti-Semitism, the worship of brute might, the repudiation of law and fair dealing among nations, and so forth.

But is there the slightest probability that the enemy would accept these terms? If not, the offer to open negotiations would be a futile and idle gesture. And how can we ask our government to make so foolish a move? If Hitler and Tojo are prepared to negotiate on the foregoing terms, they are prepared to surrender unconditionally, since there is no difference whatever between such surrender and the terms in question.

Certainly we cannot entertain the idea of any compromise with the enemy, and Doctor Holmes is not hinting at any compromise. If the Philadelphia Quakers agree with Doctor Holmes, then they, too, have only unconditional surrender in mind. Let the enemy accept those terms and order a cessation of hostilities and of preparations for hostilities, and the war will be over.

La Jolla, California. VICTOR S. YARROS.

Whitman Article Commended

TO UNITY:

I am sure that all lovers of Walt Whitman will rejoice because of the article, entitled "Walt Whitman: His Vital Place in our Life Today," by Leonard B. Gray, which appeared in the October issue of UNITY.

Walt Whitman fans, do you know of the splendid chapter on Walt Whitman appearing in Richard Maurice Bucke's book, entitled *Cosmic Consciousness?*

Rochester, New York. HENRIETTE POSNER.

Ethical Writings Needed

TO UNITY:

While one book of lofty inspiration like Adler's *Ethical Philosophy of Life* is read by a few, the American people read heavily of all the depressing writers like Richard Wright, Nelson Algren, Jerome Weidman, James Farrell, and the like. Though there is excellent writing in all of these men, there is no inspiration. It may be that it is not a concern of theirs, yet the effect on the wide public is observable.

Perhaps the inspiration of ethical leaders is a strong undercurrent that does not receive much notice. It would be better, however, if there were inspiring ethical writers who could match the hard-boiled American writers in cheer and good will. There should be ethical deeds that stir the blood. There should be ethical ways of making goodness so attractive that it outmatches evil in every respect.

Chicago, Illinois. CARL PETERSON.

The Coleman Case

TO UNITY:

A young Negro is barred behind the sorrow-stark walls of San Quentin. He should not be there. He was put there by those who have ideas cut very much to the savage pattern of Hitler.

One of the principles we Americans believe in is fair trial by jury. Festus Coleman did not get this. It is not possible here to go into details of this rape and robbery case. The facts may be obtained from the Festus Coleman Defense Committee, 83 McAllister St., San Francisco, California.

The trial was not an American trial. Coleman was not allowed to tell his own story on the stand. The door was slammed in the faces of his relatives when they tried to attend the trial which was conducted behind closed doors. His lawyer made no real attempt to defend him.

The Committee is working to secure a parole for Coleman by Christmas.

May I urge that all who read these words write to the California State Board of Prisons and Parole, Kohl Building, San Francisco, California, asking for the release of this innocent man?

Let us wipe out such cruel manifestations of Fascism within the borders of our own beloved country!

San Antonio, Texas. LUCIA TRENT.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 130)

the degree of Bachelor of Divinity conferred by the University in cooperation with the respective institutions. (Normally the course of training for this degree will require three years or more.) (9) Placement in professional work will remain the individual responsibility of the separate institutions. (10) Any school may withdraw from the federation on three years' notice, or in less time by common agreement of the federated schools. (11) An executive council, to be known as the Cabinet, shall have charge of the administration of the Federated Theological Faculty, including the handling of problems concerning the relationships of the institutions with one another and the initiation of the appointment of new members to the Federated Theological Faculty and of promotions within it. (12) In the financial relations of the federated schools the basic principle is that each institution shall be independently responsible for all items on its budget and that there shall be no interchange of charges between the institutions. All students of the federated schools will be registered in the University and will pay full tuition to the University. Each institution is responsible for scholarships, stipends, and other forms of financial assistance to members of its own student body.